REMARKS

Claims 27-30 were objected to for being labeled with the incorrect label identifier. Applicants have relabeled the claims with the correct identifiers and therefore this objection should be removed.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 15-22, and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama et al. (US Pat. No. 5,847,506) in view of Dodabalapur et al. (US Pat. No. 5,814,416).

The present invention will be reviewed with respect to Nakayama et al. '506 and Dodabalapur et al. '416. The purpose of this invention is to provide a white light emitting OLED device as set forth in the preamble of claim 1. As has been previously pointed out to the Examiner, neither Nakayama et al. '506 or Dodabalapur et al. '416 produce white light.

Turning to the body of claim 1, it requires a microcavity OLED device and a light-integrating element. On page 8, lines 7-8, the term integrating as used in this specification is defined as "Any structure that is effective in randomly changing the direction of light can be used to integrate the emitted light over angles." The Examiner's position is that element **2** in Nakayama et al. '506 is an integrating element. This is not correct. Element **2** does not **randomly** change the direction of light. It is one of the two reflecting mirrors that is necessary to provide a microcavity structure. All microcavities must have two spaced mirrors, one being reflective and the other being semi-transparent. In column 5, lines 39-42 of Nakayama et al. '506, it is clear that element **2** is the semi-transparent mirror. In terms of the present invention, element **2** of Nakayama et al. is the equivalent element, for example, of element **90** of OLED device **10** on page 11, lines 24-26 of the present specification. Element **2** does not provide an integrating function. It does not randomly change the direction of light because it is a specular mirror. There is no corresponding structure to the light integrating element found in claim 1 of the present invention in either Nakayama et al. or Dodabalapur et al. '416

The Examiner states that "Nakayama teaches a reflector (2) within the microcavitiy OLED device. The applicant's specification (US 20050073228) in paragraph 36, states that the light-integrating element may comprise a light reflecting film." The Examiner is correct that Nakayama et al. teaches a reflector (2). However, the Examiner should recognize that not all reflectors perform a light integrating function because most reflectors such as element 2 in Nakayama et al., reflect light specularly. Thus, applicants are quite clear in their specification that the integrating element must randomly change the direction of light. There is nothing in Nakayama et al. that performs this function.

Dodabalapur et al. '416 discloses a microcavity structure which internally produces light. A filter layer of appropriate thickness can be incorporated in the microcavity structure to control the emitted wavelength as stated in col. 1, lines 57-61. "By using different thicknesses for the filter layer in distinct regions of a planar microcavity structure, a single emissive layer of organic material can be used to construct red, green or blue light emitting elements in the distinct regions." There is no corresponding structure in Dodabalapur et al. to the integrating element set forth in claim 1 of present invention.

Dodabalapur et al. '416 does disclose a full color display with red, green and blue elements. Although it is true that a full color display could be used to display white light, it is unnecessarily complicated. For example, patterning at the subpixel scale is necessary for a full color display. The present invention does not require this patterning. Dodabalapur et al. does not make use of the light integrating element of claim 1.

Applicants fail to see any motivation for the combination of Nakayama et al. '506 and Dodabalapur et al. '416, since neither of them disclose the light integrating element of claim 1.

Claims 4, 11-14 and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama et al. (US Pat. No. 5,847,506) in view of Dodabalapur et al.(5,814,416) and further in view of Tokito et al. (US Pat. No. 5,780,174).

Nakayama et al. and Dodabalapur et al. has been discussed above. Tokito et al. discloses a microcavity structure. Element 12 of Tokito et al. is a multi-layer mirror equivalent to the element 2 of Nakayama et al. or element 90 of the present application. In Tokito et al., the semi-transparent mirror is made up of a number of thin film layers having different refractive indices. Although the layers have different refractive indices, it does not comprise "inclusions dispersed in a matrix wherein the refractive indexes of the inclusions are different from those of the matrix". Furthermore, element 12 of Tokito et al. is a specular reflector that does not provide a light integrating function.

In element 12 of Tokito et al., there are one or more TiO_2 layers. In this form, the layers are transparent and the TiO_2 is not a white pigment. To form a white pigment, the TiO_2 must be in the form of small particles dispersed in a matrix of different refractive index.

Claims 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama et al. (US Pat. No. 5,847,506) in view of Dodabalapur et al. (US Pat. No. 5,814,416) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Dodabalapur et al. (US Pat. No. 5,405,710)

Nakayama et al. '506 and Dodabalapur et al. '416 have been discussed above. Dodabalapur et al. '710 does teach different emission regions however, applicants fail to see its relevance in view of the above comments concerning Nakayama et al.'506 and Dodabalapur et al. '416.

In any event, claim 1 is the only independent claim and it is believed to set forth new and unobvious subject matter. The remaining claims all depend on this claim and should be allowed along with it.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.